

fugitive rebel and to stand his trial Secondly, arms were found concealed about his premises. Lastly, he refused to take the oath disowning the declaration of war against the King issued by the Covenanters, or to swear not to rise in arms against the King. To sum up, his execution was strictly legal, implied no special barbarity in the officer who ordered it, and would not have taken place if he had been willing to pledge himself to keep the peace.¹ The omission of a number of material facts by Macaulay, the selection of the least trustworthy authority as the basis of his story, and the alteration of the statement made by that authority in order to make the story more probable, deserve severe censure.

Take another case, that of Marlborough. In chapter iv it has been shown that Macaulay uses against Marlborough evidence drawn from lampoons and pamphlets which he must have known to be untrustworthy. He accepted it because he had formed from the beginning an unfavourable estimate of Maryborough's character and swallowed any kind of testimony which seemed to confirm it. Marlborough's * public life ', he states, ' to those who can look steadily through the dazzling blaze of genius and glory, will appear a prodigy of turpitude/² It is obviously not because he deserted the cause of James II for that of William that Macaulay comes to this conclusion, though he

puts forward the statement when he is discussing that particular incident. It can hardly be because in 1691, when he was in disgrace with William, Marlborough entered into communication with James and promised to return to his allegiance. That was nothing exceptional; many another

¹ For a careful account of Brown's execution, see Tern*, John Graham of Claverhouse, pp. 197-203.
- II, 900 (vii).